



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/725,349	12/02/2003	Teresa Mujica-Fernaud	MERCK-2805	1371
23599 7590 01/23/2007 MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C. 2200 CLARENDON BLVD. SUITE 1400 ARLINGTON, VA 22201			EXAMINER OWENS, AMELIA A	
			ART UNIT 1625	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/23/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/725,349

Applicant(s)

MUJICA-FERNAUD ET AL.

Examiner

Amelia A. Owens

Art Unit

1625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 11, 14-16, 18, 21-25 and 28-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 24 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 11, 14-16, 18, 21-23 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 28, 29, 31, 32 and 34 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. The previous action is vacated.
2. Claims 1-7,11,14-16,18,21-25,28-32,34 are pending.
3. Per the petition mailed 5/16/2006 claims 24,25 remain withdrawn; claims 22,23,28-32 are rejoined. The status of claim 28 is unclear as it is listed as canceled and withdrawn.
4. The indicated allowability of claims 1-7,14-16 is withdrawn in view of the rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The rejection of claims 8-10,12,13,17,19,20,26,27,33 under 35 USC 112, 1st paragraph is dropped as the claims have been canceled.
6. Claims 11,14-16,18,21-23,30 are/remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification @ page 35 lines 23-25 define treatment as 'prevention of diseases and treatment of pre-existing conditions'. Therefore with the recitation of 'treatment' in the claims, 'prevention of diseases' is automatically included.

The specification does not enable any physician skilled in the art of medicine, to use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. "The [eight] factors to be considered have been summarized as the quantity of experimentation necessary, the amount of direction or guidance presented, the presence or absence of working examples, the nature of the invention, the state of the prior art, the relative skill of those in that art, the predictability or unpredictability of the art and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. All of the factors have been considered, but only the most pertinent discussed below. The main issue is the correlation between clinical efficacy for treatment per se; treatment that encompasses prevention; or 'treatment of pre-existing conditions' named and Applicants' assay outlined on pages 37-38 of the specification.

a) Determining if any particular claimed compound would treat any of the named diseases would require synthesis of the compound, formulation into a suitable dosage form, and

Art Unit: 1625

subjecting it clinical trials with the number of fundamentally different recited diseases described in the specification, or to testing them in an assay known to be correlated to clinical efficacy of such treatment. This is a large quantity of experimentation. b) The direction concerning treating the named diseases is found in the specification, which merely states Applicants' intention to do so. Applicants describe formulations at page 35 line 35 thru 36 line 31. Doses required to practice their invention are described page 36 lines 32-36. A range of doses is recommended. Since no 2-benzoylchromone compound has ever been used to treat any human disease, how is the skilled physician to know what dose to use for each of these different diseases? There are no guidelines for determining the doses needed to provide a positive effect vs. a negative effect vs. no effect. Are the identical doses to be used for treating these unrelated diseases? There is a VEGF receptor kinase assay described at page 37 line 31 thru 42 line 27 - with no data. It is unclear if this assay is correlated to the named diseases. c) There is no working example of treatment of any of the named diseases in man or animals. Again, the VEGF receptor kinase assay is noted. d) The nature of the invention is clinical treatment of disease with compounds of the claims, which involves physiological activity. It is noted that treatment also encompasses prevention. e) The state of the clinical arts is that tyrosine kinase receptors were just identified as potential targets for small cell lung cancer. See Jafri, Mechanisms of metastasis as related to receptor tyrosine kinase in small-cell lung cancer, PMID: 14529091 (2003). Further, it is not seen where tyrosine kinase is implicated in the treatment of rickets, for example.

f) The artisan using Applicants invention would be a physician with a MD degree and several years of experience. g) It is well established that "the scope of enablement varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved", and physiological activity is generally considered to be an unpredictable factor. See *In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 18, at 24 (In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, the scope of enablement obviously varies inversely with the degree of unpredictability of the factors involved.), *Nationwide Chemical Corporation, et al. v. Wright, et al.*, 192 USPQ 95 (one skilled in chemical and biological arts cannot always reasonably predict how different chemical compounds and elements might behave under varying circumstances), *Ex parte Sudilovsky* 21 USPQ2d 1702 (Appellant's invention concerns pharmaceutical activity. Because there is no evidence of record of analogous activity for similar compounds, the art is relatively

Art Unit: 1625

unpredictable) *In re Wright* 27 USPQ2d 1510 (the physiological activity of RNA viruses was sufficiently unpredictable that success in developing specific avian recombinant virus vaccine was uncertain). h) The scope of the claims involves all of the many compounds of the claims as well as the many named diseases mentioned in the claims. Thus, the scope of claims is broad.

MPEP §2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is clearly justified here and undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicants' invention.

7. Claims 1-7,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making salts of the claimed compounds, does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvates and hydrates (note specification @ page 17 lines 24-27 define solvates to include hydrates) of the claimed compounds. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art of synthetic organic chemistry to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. "The factors to be considered [in making an enablement rejection] have been summarized as a) the quantity of experimentation necessary, b) the amount of direction or guidance presented, c) the presence or absence of working examples, d) the nature of the invention, e) the state of the prior art, f) the relative skill of those in that art, g) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, h) and the breadth of the claims", *In re Rainer*, 146 USPQ 218 (1965); *In re Colianni*, 195 USPQ 150, *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546. In the present case the important factors leading to a conclusion of undue experimentation are the absence of any working example of a formed solvate, the lack of predictability in the art, and the broad scope of the claims.

c) There is no working example of any hydrate or solvate formed. The claims are drawn to solvates, yet the examples presented all fail to produce a solvate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there is no evidence that such compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated

Art Unit: 1625

compounds... there is ... no evidence that such compounds even exist." The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that solvates of these compounds actually exist; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, applicants must show that solvates can be made, or limit the claims accordingly.

g) The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a solvate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). West, Anthony R., "Solid State Chemistry and its Applications, Wiley, New York, 1988, pages 358 & 365. The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is their compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. In the same paragraph on page 365 West (Solid State Chemistry) explains that it is possible to make meta-stable non-equilibrium solvates, further clouding what Applicants mean by the word solvate. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to solvates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stabile region of the solvate.

h) The breadth of the claims includes all of the hundreds of compounds of formula I as well as the presently unknown list of solvents embraced by the term "solvate". Thus, the scope is broad.

8. Claims 28,29,31,32,34 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Art Unit: 1625

Certain Observations

9. Claims 22-23 contain additional ingredients. Support is found @ page 28 line 34 thru 32 line 6. It is well within the purview of the artisan skilled in the pharmaceutical arts to combine active ingredients.
10. The compounds are neither taught nor suggested by the prior art.
11. See action mailed 5/2/2006 for Jafri reference. The reference appears in Pair.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Amelia A. Owens whose telephone number is 571-272-0690. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas C. McKenzie can be reached on 571-272-0670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Amelia A. Owens
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1625